

SEP 21 2001 DM

To:

From: Perry Madsen

Re: Reopen/Reconsider U.S. District Court

Case No. C00-1277 P

#01-35349

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
DEPUTY

BY

In an effort to assist Mr. Madsen an Amicus Brief is needed, in order that a new line of communications between Mr. Madsen and the court's can be started.

In the course of poor judgement and self-destructive behavior, Mr. Madsen misjudged the reception as well as consequences of his ill fated assault upon the judicial process.

A judge sitting in on or tribunal witnessing such misguided attempts at closure should not give vent to personal spleen or respond to personal grievances, because in them lie subtle ingredients of what constitutes a quest for justice. In Mr. Madsen's case justice would be served if it at least satisfied the appearance of justice.

Due to Mr. Madsen's own actions he has been deprived due process.

A Humble Mr. Madsen would appreciate your help at getting his case back in Court in order to receive something

RECEIVE



CV 00-1277 #19

19

that at least satisfies an appearance of meaningful due process.

Will you direct Mr. Madsen to the appropriate Court to petition for a Discretionary Review using Mayberry vs. Pennsylvania 400 U.S. 455, 27 L.Ed.2d 532, 91 S.Ct. 499, (70) to illustrate the error committed by permitting the judge who was the target of attack upon his person by Mr. Madsen, as the deliverer of imposed sanction for the attacks.

Mr. Madsen was ill prepared to represent him-self in St. v. Dougherty, 33 Wn. App. 466, 655 P.2d 1187 (82) and knowing and intelligently waiver requires a penetrating and comprehensive examination to ascertain the reasons someone would face the dangers of going into court without effective and meaningful access as well as representation as recognized in Bounds v. Smith 430 U.S. 817 52 L.Ed.2d 72, 97

S. Ct. 1491 (77). Some form of review of Mr. Madsen as 5 years for a non-felony conviction surely is an eighth amendment violation. There is nothing in the record to uphold Mr. Madsen's going through this whole process without counsel.

Standby counsel may in the furtherance

....
of justice be appointed even over the
defendants objection; Faretta vs. California, 422
U.S. 806, 834-35 n. 46 45 L. Ed. 2d 562, 95
S. Ct. 2525 (75); St. v. Fritz, 21 Wn. App. 354

I declare under penalty of perjury under the
laws of the State of Washington the foregoing
is true and correct

Dated this 19 day of SEPTEMBER, 2001

Perry Madsen
Perry Madsen
PLAINTIFF,

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR KING COUNTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

Perry Maassen

vs. Phillips
Sharon Hayden
Heather Schwall

Defendant.

CCN: _____

No. 01-35349 SEA

PRO SE DEFENDANT'S
REQUEST TO NOTE CRIMINAL MOTION
(CLERK'S ACTION REQUIRED)

TRIAL DATE NA

To: CLERK, King County Superior Court
NORM MALENG, King County Prosecuting Attorney

FILED
LOGGED
RECEIVED

MAIL

SEP 21 2001

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
BY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE of the defendant's request to note a motion

- ☐ to compel discovery
- ☐ to compel disclosure of confidential informants
- ☐ to sever counts
- ☐ to sever defendants

Defendant requests that the motion be heard on Tuesday, _____, _____ at 2:30 p.m. in
the Criminal Motions Courtroom.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant - Pro Se

Mailed to the Prosecuting Attorney on SEPTEMBER 19, 2001

PRO SE DEFENDANT'S REQUEST TO NOTE CRIMINAL MOTION
(IN CUSTODY)
APPROVED /99

SCOMIS CODE: NTHG

In The Superior Court of the State of
Washington in and for King County

✓ Perry Madsen
PLAINTIFF,

Darrell Philips
Sharon Hayden
Heather Schwall
DEFENDANTS,

No. 01-35349

(Clerk action Required)
Motion for legal
representation in
Cause No. of present
Confinement.

FILED
LOGGED
RECEIVED

MAIL

SEP 21 2001

BY SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
DEPUTY

The plaintiff whom is presently in the
King County Jail, is requesting an
appearance in court with counsel to seek
some form of review of his confinement.
see attached declaration.

For reasons stated in accompanying declaration
plaintiff ask court to hold him to less
stringent requirements and grant this motion